





UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING D	PATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/525,206	03/14/2	000	Marcus Peinado	MS1-394US	7714	
22801	7590	12/16/2003		EXAM	EXAMINER	
LEE & HA			BACKER, FIRMIN			
421 W RIVE SPOKANE,		UE SUITE 500		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
51 51 2 11 12 ,	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			3621		

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			1/
	Application N .	A cant(s)	-
·	09/525,206	PEINADO ET AL.	/
Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit	
	Firmin Backer	3621	
The MAILING DATE of this c mmunication appeared for Reply	pears n the cover sheet with the c	rresp ndence addres	ss
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL	Y IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM	
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replection of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute. - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	I 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this commu D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08</u>	October 2003		
	nis action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow		osecution as to the m	erits is
closed in accordance with the practice under Disposition of Claims	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.	
4) Claim(s) 1-66 is/are pending in the application	٦.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-66</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•	
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	•		
Applicant may not request that any objection to th		• •	
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on		ved by the Examiner.	
If approved, corrected drawings are required in re 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	•		
	annine.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120) (a) = = (f)	
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(a) or (t).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	la hace hace re-sited		
1. Certified copies of the priority document		an Na	
2. Certified copies of the priority document3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority			
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		ge
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest	•		olication).
a) The translation of the foreign language pro	ovisional application has been rec	eived.	·
Attachment(s)	33 120		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _	5) Notice of Informal F	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-15	

Response to Amendment

This is in response to an amendment file on October 8th, 2003 for letter for patent filed on March 14th, 2000. In the amendment, no claim has been amended, no claim has been canceled, and no claim has been added. Claims 1-66 remain pending in the letter.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-66 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halstead et al. (U.S. Patent 6,230,318) in view of Folmsbee (U.S. Patent No. 6,598,166).
- 4. As per claim 1, Halstead et al teach a method of providing an initial good to a computer wherein the initial digital good include a plurality of selectively arranged parts in an initial configuration and the initial digital good is configured as to not properly function with the

Application/Control Number: 09/525,206

Árt Unit: 3621

computer with at least one computer such that the plurality of selectively arrange parts in the modified digital good have been rearrange to have a substantially unique operative configuration tat properly functions with the computer and is different that the initial configuration and causing the at least one computer to run the modified digital good (see column 2 lines 33-47, 3 lines 1-10, 12 lines 36-53). Kurachi et al receiving unique key data and converting the initial good into a modified digital good using unique key data to selectively individualize the initial digital (2lines 23-67). However, Folmsbee teaches receiving unique key data and converting the initial good into a modified digital good using unique key data to selectively individualize the initial digital. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in that art at the time the invention was made to modify Halstead et al's inventive concept to include Folmsbee's receiving unique key data and converting the initial good into a modified digital good using unique key data to selectively individualize the initial digital because this would have prevented user with complete access to the executable software and its copy protection system so that the user cannot figure out how the system works and use this information to defeat the software's copy protection system, certainly to disable the software's copy protection scheme.

5. As per claims 2-66, they disclose the same inventive concept as claim 1. Therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Application/Control Number: 09/525,206

Árt Unit: 3621

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Firmin Backer whose telephone number is (703) 305-0624. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 9:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on (703) 305-9768. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Page 4

Art Unit 3621

December 7, 2003